



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,496	03/01/2002	Brian Chess	NetLedger 709	7530
7590	10/05/2005			
Robert Moll 1173 St. Charles Court Los Altos, CA 94024			EXAMINER GOLD, AVI M	
			ART UNIT 2157	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/071,496

Applicant(s)

CHESS ET AL.

Examiner

Avi Gold

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 July 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the amendment filed on July 13, 2005. Claims 1 and 3-7 were amended. Claims 8-18 were added. Claims 1-18 are pending.

### *Response to Amendment*

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rangarajan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,510,439.

Rangarajan teaches the invention as claimed including a method and system for providing coherency between files in a group of files retrieved over an Internet connection (see abstract).

Regarding claim 1, Rangarajan teaches a client-side caching system, comprising:

a client for issuing a request based on user selection for a resource on a server (col. 4, lines 41-47, Rangarajan discloses a client requesting a document through a server); and

a server for sending a response including a cookie and a client-side script to the client, wherein the cookie value represents the last version of the resource, and the client-side script appends the cookie value to the request for a resource and the client automatically requests the resource with the appended cookie value so that if the most recent version of the resource is in the client cache, the resource is retrieved from client cache rather than from the server, and if not, is retrieved from the server (col. 7, lines 8-16, Rangarajan discloses a cookie and script sent to a client; col. 7, lines 31-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11, Rangarajan discloses a client making requests, the cookie being updated, and the cookie having stored data within it).

Regarding claim 2, Rangarajan teaches the client-side caching system of claim 1, wherein the resource is a web page, the resource is located at a URL, and the client is a web browser with a browser cache (col. 7, lines 8-16, Rangarajan discloses that the resource is located at a URL and that the cookie is sent back and stored on the web browser).

Regarding claim 3, Rangarajan teaches the client-side caching system of claim 1, wherein the response includes a non-displayed relatively small page and the cookie

is in a response header and the client-side script is in the entity body of the response (col. 7, lines 31-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 4, Rangarajan teaches the client-side caching system of claim 1, wherein the client-side script that appends the cookie value to the request is embedded in a displayed page (col. 7, lines 31-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 5, Rangarajan teaches a server for a client-side caching system, comprising:

a server for receiving a client request for a resource, updating a database, creating and inserting a cookie and a client-side script in a response to the client, wherein the cookie value represents the last version of the resource, the client-side script appends the cookie value to the request for a resource such that the client automatically re-requests the resource with the appended cookie value so that if the most recent version of the resource is in the client cache, the resource is retrieved from client cache rather than from the server, and if not, the resource is retrieved from the server (col. 7, lines 8-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 6, Rangarajan teaches the server of claim 5, wherein the server includes a web server for listening to client requests, the resource is a web page, and an application server for creating the cookie and inserting the cookie into a response

header and inserting the client-side script into the entity body of the response (col. 7, lines 8-16, lines 31-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 7, Rangarajan teaches the server of claim 6, wherein the server sets the cookie value by determining the last modified time of each page in the same class as the page which is the subject of the request, and sets the cookie value to the maximum value of the last modified times (col. 7, lines 31-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 8, Rangarajan teaches the client-side caching system of claim 2, wherein the server sets the cookie value by determining the last modified time of each web page in the same class as the web page which is the subject of the request, and sets the cookie value to the maximum value of the last modified times (col. 6, lines 38-40, col. 9, lines 22-37, Rangarajan discloses a cookie specifying a time).

Regarding claim 9, Rangarajan teaches a client-side caching system, comprising:

a client for issuing a request based on a user selection for a resource stored on a server and for receiving a server response including a cache control object and a client-side script, wherein the cache control object represents the correct version of the resource, the client-side script appends the cache control object value to the request for the resource, and the client automatically re-requests the resource with the appended

cache control object value so that if the correct version of the resource is in the client cache, the resource is retrieved from the client cache rather than from the server, and if not, the resource is retrieved from the server (col. 7, lines 8-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 10, Rangarajan teaches the client-side caching system of claim 9, wherein the resource is a web page located at a URL, the correct version is the last version of the resource, and the client is a web browser with a browser cache (col. 7, lines 8-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 11, Rangarajan teaches the client-side caching system of claim 10, wherein the request and the response are HTTP compliant, the response is a relatively small non-displayed page, the cache control object is a cookie in a response header, and the client-side script is in the entity body of the response (col. 7, lines 8-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 12, Rangarajan teaches the client-side caching system of claim 9, wherein the client-side script that appends the cache control object to the request is embedded in a displayed page (col. 7, lines 8-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 13, Rangarajan teaches the client-side caching system of claim 9, wherein Internet protocols define communication between the client and the server, and the correct version is the last version of the resource (col. 7, lines 8-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 14, Rangarajan teaches the client-side caching system of claim 11, wherein the server sets the cookie value by determining the last modified time of each page in the same class as the page which is the subject of the request, and sets the cookie value to the maximum value of the last modified times (col. 7, lines 8-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 15, Rangarajan teaches a method of client-side caching in a server, comprising:

receiving a client request for a web page; and  
inserting a cookie and a client-side script in response to the client request, wherein the cookie value represents the last version of the web page, wherein the client-side script appends the cookie value to the client request for the web page such that the client automatically re-requests the web page with the appended cookie value so that if the most recent version of the web page is in the client cache, the web page is retrieved from client cache rather than from the server, and if not, the web page is retrieved from the server (col. 7, lines 8-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).



Regarding claim 16, Rangarajan teaches the method of claim 15, further comprising determining the last modified time of each web page in the same class as the web page which is the subject of the request, and setting the cookie value to the maximum value of the last modified times (col. 7, lines 8-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 17, Rangarajan teaches the method of claim 15, further comprising:

reviewing the extension of the requested web page to determine run time environment;

loading the run time environment; and

updating a database with information from the client request (col. 7, lines 8-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 18, Rangarajan teaches a method of client-side caching in a browser, comprising:

presenting a user selection for a web page at a URL; and

receiving a server response including a cookie and client-side script, wherein the cookie value represents the most recent version of the web page, the client-side script appends the cookie value to the URL and automatically re-requests the web page with rewritten URL of the URL with the appended cookie value so that if the most recent version of the web page is in the browser cache, the web page is retrieved from the

browser cache, and if not, the resource is retrieved from the server (col. 7, lines 8-44, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11).

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed July 13, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the argument to claim 1, the applicant argues that the reference, Rangarajan, does not disclose a client-side script sent to a client or the appending of the cookie value to the request for a resource. The examiner disagrees, as seen in, col. 7, lines 8-44, there is the script which is sent to the client after a client request and the URL and cookies are sent as well. It is inherent that the cookies would have an appended value. Rangarajan also states that the particular implementation of such a CGI script will be apparent to one of skill in the art and is therefore not discussed in detail herein.

### ***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,834,294 to Katz

U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,705 to Pardikar et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,327,608 to Dillingham

U.S. Pat. No. 6,785,769 to Jacobs et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,226,642 to Beranek et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,178,461 to Chan et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,026,474 to Carter et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Avi Gold whose telephone number is 571-272-4002. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2157


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Avi Gold

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2157

AMG

  
ARIETTEANNE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100